REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 are independent.

Applicant has canceled claims 3, 9 and 15.

The examiner uses Rosser to reject claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17 and 19-22 as having been anticipated.

Applicant is bewildered. Rosser has nothing to do with applicant's claimed invention. Rosser is all about allowing advertisers to target specific ads or indicia to viewers having specific viewing profiles. Rosser discloses a method of monitoring the usage and viewing habits of a viewer, developing a view profile from the monitoring, matching ads in a database with the viewer profile, and inserting matched ads in a video stream sent to the user:

> **Individual televisions or other video reception devices are associated with set-top boxes that monitor the usage and viewing habits of the television set or other video reception device. A viewer profile derived from data acquired from said monitoring is created wherein the viewer profile indicates certain characteristics about the viewer. This profile is transmitted to a centralized database, said centralized database being an intermediate link between the origin of the video broadcast and the end viewer. The purpose of the database is to link specific insertable indicia with matching specific viewer profiles. The insertable indicia are encoded directly into the broadcast video and re-broadcast to the end viewer where the set-top box decodes the broadcast video and performs insertion of the indicia. [Rosser, Abstract]**

This is very different from applicant's claimed invention. For example, applicant's claims 1, 7 and 13, as amended, recite "looking-up a matching 3-D object in an image library, wherein the library comprises one or more 3-D objects," or similar language. Rosser fails to disclose or describe at least this quoted claim feature.

The examiner argues that this feature is shown in Rosser at col. 10, lines 29-35, and at col. 7, lines 55-58, reproduced below for the convenience of the examiner:

> **Profile matcher 96 also selects which of the stored video insertions 90 are fed to warp unit 100. Warp unit 100 takes the appropriate model information 88 and uses it to warp the appropriate text video 98 and the appropriate video insertion 90 into the appropriate pose required to make the insertion behave as if it were part of the natural scene. [Rosser, col. 10, 29-35]**

> **The different insertions may be permanently stored locally in memory device. 55, or downloaded, there during or prior to transmission of the live video transmission in which they are inserted. [Rosser, col. 7, lines 55-58]**

Looking at the above, and at all of Rosser, nowhere does Rosser disclose, describe or even mention looking-up a matching 3-D object in an image library. Rosser inserts video indicia into video broadcasts:

Applicant : Dan Kikinis   Attorney's Docket No.: 091451.00129
Serial No. : 09/782,896
Filed : February 13, 2001
Page : 8 of 9

> In particular, the down stream unit 46 is able to use the information generated by the recognition unit 18, the tracking unit 20, and the occlusion mask production unit 22 to perform seamless insertion of still, animated, and live video indicia into the video stream in a way that can make the inserted indicia appear to the end user as if it were part of the original scene 10. [Rosser, col. 7, lines 38-45]

The only matching that occurs in Rosser is the matching of a viewer profile to targeted video indicia:

> Matching a viewer usage profile 74 of the current set-top device 44 and the required viewer usage profile 94 is done by profile matcher 96 which selects required text data 92 to be fed to text-to-video converters 98. [Rosser, col. 10, lines 26-29]

Claims 1, 7 and 13, as amended, also recite "using the matching 3-D object to generate an enhanced first advertisement, wherein the enhanced first advertisement has a 3-D highlighted rendering of the image replacing the 2-D image," or similar language. Here again Rosser fails to disclose or describe this quoted claim feature.

Insertion is very different from replacement. Rosser inserts while applicant replaces.

Accordingly, claims 1, 7 and 13 are not anticipated by Rosser.

The examiner also uses Rosser to reject claims 6, 12 and 18 as having been obvious.

Claims 1, 7 and 13, as amended, recite "looking-up a matching 3-D object in an image library, wherein the library comprises one or more 3-D objects," or similar language. As described above, Rosser fails to teach or suggest this quoted claimed feature.

Claims 1, 7 and 13, as amended, recite "using the matching 3-D object to generate an enhanced first advertisement, wherein the enhanced first advertisement has a 3-D highlighted rendering of the image replacing the 2-D image," or similar language. As described above, Rosser fails to teach or suggest this quoted claim feature.

Accordingly, claims 1, 7 and 13 are not obvious in view of Rosser.

Claims 6, 12 and 18 depend upon, and add further limitations to, claims 1, 7 and 13. Accordingly, claims 6, 7 and 18 are not obvious in view of Rosser.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as

an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 11, 2006

Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

Holland & Knight LLP
10 St. James Avenue
Boston, MA 02116
Telephone: (617) 573-5879
Facsimile: (617) 523-6850

3779353_v1